

1956

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9629

title 3 would be obligated for \$3 billion or \$6 billion. It is true that that \$6 billion item is in there; but I offered to the Committee on Rules yesterday, when I faced them, an amendment that would strike out the \$6 billion and insert in lieu thereof the actual Government obligation.

A preceding section of title 3 says that the Government shall assume one-half of the carrying charges of this indebtedness during the construction period. That is the 4-year period that we are talking about. The going interest rate the Government would have to pay for money is 2½ percent. Two and a half percent of \$6 billion is \$150 million.

I offered an amendment to strike out the \$6 billion, which is the overall size of the construction program and to substitute therefor the exact Government obligation of \$150 million. I am still willing, when the bill comes to the floor—and I am personally pledging myself to do so—to offer that amendment.

I am also offering an amendment, to answer the gentleman's objection, to strike out the section on page 24 that would take away from the Comptroller General and vest in the Commissioner of Education the authority to audit the handling of this money. I believe the gentleman will admit that I made that proposal to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] was very fair about the whole thing and freely admitted these defects in the bill, and I do not know what other defects there may be in it. But the gentleman is going to offer an amendment as an individual Member of the House. I called his attention to the matter 3 months ago when this bill was before the Committee on Rules and he then agreed that the bill ought to be amended. I suggested that his committee should take the matter up and offer a committee amendment. I asked the question yesterday, and the gentleman advised me that his committee has taken no action on it. Whatever the amount may be that is authorized, I do not know what the gentleman will offer in place of the \$6 billion; but the servicing of this \$6 billion debt includes not only the interest, but the amortization and it is so stated in the bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman is correct in saying that he made this objection back in February when I first appeared before the Committee on Rules. I promised him that I would prepare the necessary amendments and submit them to the Committee on Rules. But they quit considering the school-construction bill at that point and I never had the opportunity to get back before the Committee on Rules to find out whether the amendments were satisfactory.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman misapprehends the function of the Committee on Rules. We have nothing to do with amendments. It was just a friendly suggestion to help correct errors in this bill. That is the

function of the Committee on Labor and the Committee on Labor has not offered any amendment up to now.

Mr. BAILEY. As a member of the committee I propose to offer the amendment on the floor.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I want to say this; the latest figures that I have from the Department of Education are to the effect that the pupil load per teacher in the United States 20 years ago was 32-and-a-fraction per teacher. Today the figure is 26-and-a-fraction pupils per teacher, a smaller load today than it was 20 years ago, on an average all over the Nation. The only schools that are congested are those in what we call impacted areas and we have legislation on the books to take care of those. So, I advise the Members of this House to get the latest figures on the pupil load per teacher and not to accept these statements that there is a crowded condition in the public schools all over the United States.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, we have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit while the House is in session during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 516 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11040) to advance the scientific and professional research and development programs of the Departments of Defense, the Interior, and Commerce, to improve the management and administration of certain departmental activities, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the

previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentlemen from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and yield myself such times as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 11040, an amendment of the Classification Act. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], the ranking member of that committee, are present. As far as I know, there is no opposition to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. I think the legislation involved here is long overdue and that it is essential that it be passed forthwith if we are to retain our leading position in technological development of our armed services.

I serve on a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee that has recently visited most of the airplane plants, and we were told of the shortage of engineers, physicists, and scientific people who are so necessary in the development of these newer instruments of war.

The Federal Government has always lagged behind private industry in paying adequate salaries to people in this category. It was less than 10 years ago that the ceiling of \$10,000 for Federal pay was broken. We have never been realistic in adopting legislation that would recognize the necessity for an adequate number of people in these higher brackets to operate the agencies of Government that have to do with the new weapons of war and with atomic energy.

Our scientific people, who must sit opposite the highly paid technicians and skilled people in private industry, find themselves at a disadvantage. As we develop these people within Government, they are siphoned off into private industry because they cannot afford to work for the salaries we give them. The few that have remained are devoted people who have stayed on because in most cases they have earned and have a certain interest in Government due to their retirement privileges.

I think this committee is to be congratulated in bringing out this proposed legislation. I congratulate the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], and the other members of the committee on so doing. I trust the rule will be adopted forthwith and that the bill will be put on its way so that we can keep the Government in the forefront in this important field so essential to our national defense.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to yield any time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole

House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11040) to advance the scientific and professional research and development programs of the Departments of Defense, the Interior, and Commerce, to improve the management and administration of certain departmental activities, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11040, with Mr. Sikes in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 13 minutes.

(Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this bill represents a major change in the allocation and numbers of scientific and technical positions and positions in the highest three grades under the Classification Act. It will have a direct effect on all departments and agencies, but more specifically it will affect the Departments of Defense, Commerce, and Interior, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

It has become necessary, because of the increasing need for emphasis on research and development and the critical shortage of scientists and technicians to reappraise and bring up to date the law governing the number and allocation of scientific and technical positions. These positions are provided for under Public Law 313 of the 80th Congress.

At the present time there are 45 of these positions in the Department of Defense and 10 in the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

There will be an increase of 230 technical and scientific positions for the Department of Defense, 50 for the National Security Agency, 50 for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and the establishment of 35 such positions in the Department of Commerce and 10 in the Department of the Interior. These positions are all keyed to our national defense.

Those in the Department of Commerce will be allocated as follows: 23 to the Bureau of Standards, 2 to the Weather Bureau, 3 to the Maritime Administration, 2 to the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and 5 to the Civil Aeronautics Authority. In the Department of the Interior they will be allocated as follows: 5 to the Geological Survey and 5 to the Bureau of Mines.

These agencies, charged with vital responsibility for developing and maintaining a strong and effective national defense, are facing serious handicaps due to the lack of sufficient higher-salaried

positions to attract and keep the necessary engineers, scientists, technicians, and administrators to carry out their programs with dispatch and effectiveness. This condition is especially evident in the fields of research and development. Requirements for the development of missiles and test vehicles for the expanded guided missile programs, for new nuclear applications, for many new types of combat and support aircraft, and for experimental ships of many classes have created pressing needs for the highest caliber technical and executive leadership.

It should be noted that there are two other groups of scientific positions that have been allocated under Appropriation Act riders. These are 60 positions in the Public Health Service—Public Law 195, 84th Congress—and 5 positions in the Department of Agriculture—Public Law 496, 80th Congress.

The second feature of this bill is the allocation to the Department of Defense of its own group of 285 positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the Classification Act in a manner similar to that already established for the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the General Accounting Office. The net effect with respect to the Department of Defense will be that they will have an increase of 95 positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 and an increase of 201 positions in the technical and scientific categories, which includes 50 specifically earmarked for the National Security Agency.

The net effect of this bill, as far as the GS-16, 17, and 18 positions that are allocated by the Civil Service Commission are concerned, is that at the present time there are approximately 22 out of the fixed total of 1,200 available for distribution to the departments and agencies other than Defense. If this bill is approved, there will be some 290 positions available.

The Civil Service Commissioners will continue to allocate the positions for the top three grades in the Classification Act except for the Department of Defense, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the General Accounting Office, and the Library of Congress.

If this legislation is approved, we will then have the following pattern throughout the Government, taking into consideration positions in the three top grades of the Classification Act and positions allocated under Public Law 313: *Classification Act positions of grades 16, 17, and 18*

Under allocation by Civil Service Commission.....	1,200
Department of Defense.....	285
Federal Bureau of Investigation.....	37
General Accounting Office.....	25
Library of Congress.....	29
Various agencies by special legislation.....	25
Total.....	1,601

*Scientific and technical positions allocated under Public Law 313*

Department of Defense.....	275
National Security Agency.....	50
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	60
Department of Commerce.....	35
Department of the Interior.....	10
Total.....	430

*Scientific and professional positions allocated under appropriation riders*

Public Health Service.....	60
Department of Agriculture.....	6
Total.....	66

Mr. Chairman, I would like to emphasize to the House that this is an urgent matter. I hope it will be acted upon promptly by the Congress in order that we can have a more effective and efficient top-level working force dealing with these important Government matters, particularly in research and development.

Our committee held very extensive hearings. Among those testifying were the following:

Hon. Reuben R. Robertson, Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Henry A. DuFlon, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Manpower, Personnel, and Reserve.

Mr. Leon L. Wheeler, Director of Civilian Personnel, Policy Division, Department of Defense.

Lt. Gen. Ralph J. Canine, Director, National Security Agency.

Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Director, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Dr. John F. Victory, executive secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Mr. Paul G. Dembling, legal adviser, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Mr. Robert J. Lacklen, personnel officer, National Committee for Aeronautics.

Mr. Carlton W. Hayward, Director, Office of Personnel Management, Department of Commerce.

Dr. A. V. Astin, Director, National Bureau of Standards.

Dr. Francis W. Reichelderfer, Chief, Weather Bureau.

Mr. Otis Beasley, Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior.

Mr. Thomas Miller, Acting Director, Bureau of Mines.

Dr. Thomas B. Nolan, Director, Geological Survey.

Hon. Philip Young, Chairman, Civil Service Commission.

Hon. George M. Moore, Civil Service Commissioner.

Our hearings fully documented the use that would be made of the technical and scientific positions. They include such positions as the following:

(A) Director of Guided Missiles, Office of Secretary of Defense;

(B) Chief, Guided Missile Development, Redstone Arsenal, Department of Army;

(C) Chief Nuclear Physicist, Bureau of Ships, Department of Navy; and

(D) Director, Rocket Engine Test Laboratory, Department of the Air Force.

With respect to the National Security Agency, most of us know what a very important part that Agency plays in our whole national defense setup. We received testimony from Lt. Gen. Ralph J. Canine, Director of the National Security Agency in executive session, and the committee was so impressed with the need for adequately compensating people who have devoted a lifetime to this very important area, that at the

1956

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9631

request of General Canine we increased the amount from the original submission of 35 to 50 of these positions.

We hope this action will settle, not only for the present, but for some time to come, the issues that have been raised with respect to the supergrades, or grades 16, 17, and 18. Appropriation riders and other provisions of special legislation have given certain employees or certain positions salaries or grades above that which their positions warrant. They have not considered these special grants in relation to all other similar positions throughout the Federal Government.

The Civil Service Commission will have approximately 270 additional supergrade positions to allocate. They have over 500 requests for the allocations of these positions. The Commission, in their testimony before the committee, estimated that about 50 percent of the requests would probably not be justified, so this indicates that, at the present time, if this legislation is approved, we would be providing positions adequately to treat all employees fairly and equitably.

The committee has included a reporting procedure in this bill which will enable the Congress to more clearly determine the manner in which these higher grade positions are being used. As far as the scientific and technical positions are concerned, we were provided with a detailed report from the Department of Defense identifying and describing the positions presently being occupied under Public Law 313, and those which it proposed to put under that authority. It is indeed an impressive document, not only indicating the important responsibilities of many of these scientists, but indicating as well that our country is doing an extensive amount of research and development directed toward our national defense.

The estimated cost of this legislation in increased payroll is \$1,534,250 for the Department of Defense, \$464,280 for the National Security Agency, \$100,000 for the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, \$21,200 for the Department of Interior, \$151,380 for the Department of Commerce and, if all 286 positions are utilized by the Civil Service Commission, \$644,000 for other departments and agencies, making a total estimated increase of \$2,915,110 in annual payroll costs.

To sum up, may I say this—that this legislation presents a major readjustment of the positions in the Federal Government carrying salaries ranging between \$10,000 and \$15,000, both those paid under the Classification Act and those paid as scientific and technical positions under the authority of Public Law 313, 80th Congress.

In addition, the bill sets aside a specific allocation of 285 positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 for the Department of Defense in the same manner as we have previously provided them for the General Accounting Office and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This action makes available for departments and agencies outside of the Department of Defense 269 positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 which are presently allocated to

the Department of Defense by the Civil Service Commission.

## SALARY RANGES, SUPERGRADES

GS-16: \$12,900 to \$13,760.

GS-17: \$13,975 to \$14,620.

GS-18: \$14,800.

Mr. Chairman, I may say that the committee was unanimous in reporting this bill. It is a very important bill and I believe it is essential to our national defense. All of us are fully aware of the acute shortage of scientists, technicians, and engineers. You can read Sunday's New York Times and you will see page after page of advertisements for all kinds of engineers and scientists.

In a statement recently released by the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. entitled "Are We Losing the Race With Russia," the critical shortage of scientists and engineers is shown. Let me read it to you:

It's the trend—shown in the chart—that is alarming.

Over the last 5 years we have turned out only 142,000 engineers, compared to an estimated 216,000 in Russia. In 1955 our output was around 23,000 compared to their 63,000. Over the next 5 years our projected output is 153,000, against at least 400,000 in Russia. There will be an additional 150,000 or more in the satellites and Red China.

In another publication recently released by the same publishing company entitled "How Critical Is It?" appears the following statement:

According to the best available information, from estimates by the Engineers' Joint Council and the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, the minimum need for engineers from graduating classes is 40,000 each year for the next 10 years. Last year we graduated only 23,000 engineers, just about enough to cover replacement needs without allowing for any expansion of the number of active engineers. Projections made by the United States Office of Education indicate that we shall probably not have a class of 40,000—the current annual requirement—until 1963.

According to Dr. Howard Meyerhoff, Executive Director of the Scientific Manpower Commission, there is now a shortage of about 20,000 scientists. Last year the number of doctoral degrees in the natural sciences, almost a prerequisite for research work, was only 5,000. Dr. Meyerhoff estimates that the shortage of scientists will rise another 30,000 by 1960.

We need more scientists and engineers in our defense setup. The provisions of this bill are certainly justified. Since there is no opposition to the bill on the part of the committee I hope it may be passed unanimously.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of my committee. I think this bill is very timely and one that should be passed by the House because I think it will strengthen the scientific research of our Government a great deal. It will mean a lot to us in keeping pace with the rest of the world in that regard.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for 285 additional supergrade positions and 375 scientific and professional positions.

The passage of this legislation is of vital importance to the research and development programs concerned with the defense efforts of the Government.

The committee held 3 days of hearings and 2 executive sessions on the provisions of this bill. The deputy and assistant secretaries of the departments and the heads of the agencies concerned presented factual testimony and fully answered all questions in justification of the allocation of these top-salaried positions. Their allocations were considered in groups and by individual positions. It is believed that without exception each one of these top-salaried positions will be fully utilized in the carrying out of the activities necessary to the expanded and ever-increasing technological requirements of our defense efforts and other essential Government operations.

I want to make it clear that the positions authorized by this bill are of two types. The supergrade positions, with salaries ranging from \$11,900 to \$14,800, are to be utilized for top executive and administrative employees. The scientific and professional positions are to be utilized in the employment of engineers, physicists, and other technicians engaged in research and development activities. The salaries of this last group range from \$10,000 to \$15,000.

All positions authorized by this bill are subject to a complete review and evaluation by the Civil Service Commission. The Department of Defense is authorized to select the positions which will be recommended for both the supergrade and scientific and professional allocation. This allocation must, however, be approved by the Civil Service Commission before it can become effective. The scientific and professional positions in the other agencies are subject to the same approval.

In addition to this control by the Civil Service Commission, the bill provides for reporting requirements, in which the departments and agencies concerned must report annually on the number of such positions in existence as well as those established during the year. This report must furnish the names of the occupants, the salary they are receiving, and a complete listing of their qualifications for such positions. The agencies must also furnish such other information pertaining to these positions as the Congress may require.

There has been considerable debate in this Congress regarding the allocation of supergrade and other top-salaried positions through special legislation or riders on appropriation bills. The committee, in reporting this bill, believes that with the additional positions authorized, there will be no further justification for any department or agency to request special treatment outside of the Classification Act.

The supergrade positions were created in 1949, with authority for 400. With the enactment of this bill, there will be some 1,600 such positions. This is an increase of over 400 percent. At the same time, overall employment in the Federal Government has materially decreased.

The scientific and professional positions were created in the 80th Congress.

at which time I was chairman of the committee. The legislation at that time authorized 45 fully justified positions in the Department of Defense. With the enactment of bill H. R. 11040, there will be 495 such positions in the Federal Government. This represents an increase of over 1,100 percent. I firmly believe that these increases, even though large, are fully justified and that the requirements for specially trained and qualified top-civilian personnel in the Federal Government have increased, especially during the last 3 years and will continue to do so.

In detail, this bill provides for 285 supergrade positions and 230 new scientific and professional positions for the Department of Defense, 50 scientific and professional positions for the National Security Agency, 50 for the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, 10 for the Department of Interior, and 35 for the Department of Commerce. The action in regard to the 285 supergrade positions for the Department of Defense will release 269 such positions to the Civil Service Commission where they will be available for allocation to the other departments and agencies.

The Civil Service Commission has advised the committee that it has over 500 requests for these positions. They have indicated, however, that their experience has shown that only approximately 50 percent of the requests for supergrade positions can be justified. The 269 positions provided for by this bill should, therefore, take care of all justifiable requests for this type of position, including the 10 positions for the General Services Administration which were authorized by the House in a rider on the Independent Offices Appropriation Act and the 6 positions for the Immigration and Naturalization Service which were authorized in the State, Justice, and Judiciary Appropriations Act.

The allocations provided for by this bill entirely satisfy all requests for these top-level positions made to the committee by the departments and agencies of the executive branch. Each one of these allocations has been fully justified. There was no opposition in the committee to recommending favorable action on the provisions of the bill. I strongly recommend that the House give favorable consideration to its provisions and pass it without delay.

As a result, there are 660 high-salaried jobs; 285 are supergrade, all to Department of Defense; 375 are scientific and professor positions.

There are now 1,341 supergrades, 120 scientific, for a total of 1,461.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, we have listened to testimony concerning the problems involved in scientific research and development as they have been presented to the Committee on the Armed Services by the various branches of the armed services, especially by the personnel who were engaged in scientific research and development, as they applied to the Armed Forces. May I point out to the gentle-

man that many, many years ago there was founded the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics. I believe that was started in 1915, long before there were many airplanes used for military purposes. This illustrates how important it is to start early. All during the years the group of individuals on that committee have done a wonderful work, even back in 1915 when flying was new and novel and carried on by stunt fliers. Their wonderful work resulted in the development of practically all of the scientific contributions to the aeronautical field. This is important. The spark-plug in this endeavor was John Victory, who is still the executive secretary of NACA. So I want to congratulate the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], also the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] the able chairman of the committee, with whom the gentleman from Kansas has worked cooperatively, and I should like to join in expressing the hope that this bill will be passed unanimously.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, who is a distinguished member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Kansas. I want to commend him for his statement concerning this bill and say that I think most of the positions authorized are justified. Moreover, this is the orderly procedure for creating and allocating such positions. I have contended, as has the gentleman from Kansas, against riders upon appropriation bills creating supergrade jobs in the Government.

I do want to say, however, that I have always contended that the Government cannot compete with private employers, who operate on cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts in the matter of securing scientific and professional employees.

Let me also join with the chairman of our committee [Mr. MURRAY], in expressing the hope that we will not again in the near future be confronted with a similar request.

I want to reemphasize that the Government can never compete for personnel with those who hold cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. I repeat that this is the orderly procedure for providing supergrade jobs, and the bill also provides certain safeguards whereby in the future supergrade jobs must be justified by the various departments and agencies. That is a good feature of this bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I agree with the gentleman and I appreciate his contribution in respect to this proposed legislation.

One more thing, and that is this: I want to emphasize that this proposed legislation is the result of full and complete hearings on this question. I also want to reiterate, if I may, the thing that the gentleman from Iowa has just stated. We hope this legislation will prevent agencies from coming in and getting their supergrades approved in appropriation bills without having had hearings on the question of necessity for such positions.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. I realize that there is no particular glamor attached to it; no particular appropriation for any particular section of the country. But, I still feel very sincerely and very strongly that this is one of the most important pieces of legislation that we could enact in this session.

I am going to confine my remarks to one of the Government installations which will receive additional supergrade employees if this bill is passed, namely, the Ames Laboratory of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics which happens to be situated in my district. I work very closely with these people. I have found that their work is most important to the national defense. Ames Laboratory is developing basic research data which will result in the airplanes and guided missiles our armed services will be flying 10 to 15 years from now. The lag time between research and development, and actual manufacture is so terrific that we must, if we are going to win this cold war, be far ahead insofar as research is concerned. The Ames Laboratory represents an investment of \$64 million of the taxpayers' money, but at the same time this great, terrific investment is not adequately manned with scientific personnel due to the fact that wages are just simply not high enough. During the fiscal year 1955 Ames Laboratory was only able to recruit 33 scientists in grades GS-5 to 7, principally because the salary offered by private industry was too much higher. A comparison shows that Ames Laboratory could offer \$3,410 for a GS-5 position and \$4,205 for a GS-7. At the same time the aircraft industry was offering salaries for the equivalent of a GS-5 job of \$4,860 and a salary of \$5,940 for the equivalent of a GS-7 position. Not only was the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics unable to compete with the aeronautics industry on a salary basis, but they were required to offer less than State, county, and city governments were offering.

Unfortunately, this bill will not take care of the need for recruitment of new scientific personnel at the bottom of the ladder. The gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] and I are presently preparing a bill which would meet this very, very great need.

Though I wish the bill could go further, I am nevertheless supporting it because it does take care of the need for retaining our especially skilled and experienced scientific personnel at the top of the pay scale.

Mr. Chairman, let me give you an example of what has happened at the top of the ladder at Ames Laboratory. A GS-15 getting \$12,150 has been offered 3 positions from private industry, 1 at \$16,000 plus a \$2,500 bonus, 1 at \$16,000, and another at \$15,000. A GS-15 at \$11,880 has been offered a full professorship at four permanent universities throughout the country. He still stayed

1956

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9633

on at Ames Laboratory at a far lesser salary.

I have similar communications from the Atomic Energy Commission indicating that their need is as great and as acute as that of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

At the atomic bomb test last year at Yucca Flats in Nevada, I talked with many a scientist who could go into private industry and draw anywhere from \$25,000 to probably as high as \$50,000 per year. And yet they were living there, in the desert, under extremely adverse conditions, working for far less than \$15,000.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is making a very important and a very true statement. I can say from my own knowledge of the scientific personnel problem in the Atomic Energy Commission that while a great many of these people are staying on, there are a great many of them who are going into private industry at greatly increased salaries, sometimes double as much as they are getting and sometimes treble what they are receiving from the Government.

Within the last 2 years we have even had on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the experience of losing 3 or 4 of our valuable staff members who were in the \$10,000 to \$11,000 range and who have been hired at up to as high as \$20,000 by private industry.

This draining away from the Government into private industry is going on all the time, and if something is not done to preserve the integrity of the caliber of the personnel in our Government functions, the more qualified, and perhaps the more adventurous type will go into private industry. And unfortunately we may have left the less qualified people in the Government.

I just want to say that I am in favor of this bill. I think it is a good bill. I know there is one problem it will not solve, and that is the inadequate supply of scientists and I hope legislation will be offered to cover that matter.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, his remarks are certainly valuable. That brings me to this point. How long can we expect our scientific and technical personnel to derive the full measure of their pay from a patriotic sense of accomplishment? I feel we should pay them what they are worth, just as private industry is paying them.

In the other body there is great debate presently going on concerning appropriations for the Air Force. Personally I favor a strong Air Force and will vote for it. I favor a strong national defense in every respect. This bill is an attempt not to provide airplanes today but to provide the brains which will develop the airplanes and the guided missiles which will be flying 10 years from now when the B-52 of today is obsolete.

This is an important bill. We have in our hands the ability to go ahead and

win this cold war by providing the brains to do it, or we have in our hands the decision to remain behind and allow our potential opponents to go ahead of us.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], a member of the committee.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, this bill is vitally necessary and highly desirable. It is my own conviction that what good it does is not sufficient, but to do less would be highly disastrous.

We are asking scientists and technicians now to stay on as a patriotic duty. Many of them are doing that and continuing in their missions and projects, but some of them are finding that their families are suffering, that they are not securing the benefits that they should and, consequently, they have been forced to accept better offers in private industry. But even those who are staying should not be penalized because of their patriotic devotion to their duty.

Therefore, this bill should not only be passed unanimously, as I hope it will be, but it ought to be the forerunner of a study of just exactly what the needs of our various defense agencies are for scientists both in quantity and those who are experts in their field.

We all recognize that even some of the finest jet planes we have on order that are not yet delivered will be obsolete in a very few years and able to serve only as interim weapons as the guided missile program advances.

We know that the whole safety of the United States and the free nations allied with us may hinge on certain scientific or technological advances. If we do fail to provide ourselves with the means of keeping our leadership in the fields of science and research we fall in our fundamental job of protecting the United States and the people thereof.

Mr. Chairman, I believe and hope the Members agree that this bill should be passed unanimously, and that we should further examine the needs and proper desires of the agencies for more individuals to help us in this terrible job of defending ourselves against the Communist conspiracy.

(Mr. CORBETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That (a) subsections (a) and (b) of the first section of the act of August 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 715; Public Law 313, 80th Cong.), as amended, are amended to read as follows: "(a) The Secretary of Defense is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than 275 positions in the Department of Defense and not more than 50 positions in the National Security Agency, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development functions, relating to the national defense, military and naval medicine, and any and all other activities of the Department of Defense and the National Security Agency, as the case may be, which

require the services of specially qualified scientific or professional personnel.

"(b) The Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for, in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, not to exceed 30 positions in the professional and scientific service, each such position being established in order to enable the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to secure and retain the services of specially qualified personnel necessary in the discharge of the duty of the Committee to supervise and direct the scientific study of the problems of flight with a view to their practical solution.

"(c) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not to exceed 10 positions of a professional or scientific nature in the Department of the Interior, each such position being established in order to enable the Department of the Interior to effectuate those research and development functions and activities of such Department which require the services of specially qualified professional or scientific personnel.

"(d) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not to exceed 35 positions of a professional or scientific nature in the Department of Commerce, each such position being established in order to enable the Department of Commerce to effectuate those research and development functions and activities of such Department which require the services of specially qualified professional or scientific personnel."

(b) Nothing contained in the amendment made to such act of August 1, 1947, by subsection (a) of this section shall affect any position existing under authority of subsection (a) of the first section of such act of August 1, 1947, as in effect immediately prior to the effective date of such amendment, the compensation attached to any such position, and any incumbent thereof, his appointment thereto, and his right to receive the compensation attached thereto, until appropriate action is taken under authority of subsection (a) of such first section of such act of August 1, 1947, as contained in the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Subsection (c) of the first section of such act of August 1, 1947, as amended, is hereby redesignated subsection (e) of such first section.

(d) Section 3 of such act of August 1, 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. (a) Each officer, with respect to positions established by him under this act, shall submit to the Congress, not later than February 1 of each year, a report which sets forth—

"(1) the number of such positions so established or in existence during the immediately preceding calendar year,

"(2) the name, rate of compensation, and description of the qualifications of each incumbent of each such position, together with the position title and a statement of the functions, duties, and responsibilities performed by each such incumbent, except that nothing contained in this section shall require the resubmission of information required under this paragraph which has been reported pursuant to this section and which remains unchanged, and

"(3) such other information as he deems appropriate.

"(b) In any instance in which any officer so required to submit such report may consider full public disclosure of any or all of the above-specified items to be detrimental to the national security or the public interest, such officer is authorized—

"(1) to omit in his annual report these items with respect to which full public dis-

9634

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 20

closure is considered by him to be detrimental to the national security or the public interest.

"(2) to inform the Congress of such omission, and

"(3) at the request of any congressional committee to which such report is referred, to present information concerning such items in executive sessions of such committee."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments to section 1 and without objection the amendments will be reported and considered en bloc.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments:

On page 4, line 20, immediately before the period insert "or which may be required by the Congress or a committee thereof."

Line 23, strike out "consider" and insert "find."

Page 5, line 1, strike out "or the public interest."

Line 4, strike out "considered" and insert "found."

Lines 5 and 6, strike out "or the public interest."

Line 9, insert "all."

Lines 10 and 11, strike out "in executive sessions of such committee."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRUMPACKER: On page 2, line 13, after "exceed", strike out "sixty" and insert "one hundred."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee is still considering section 1. We have not yet passed on to section 2 of the bill.

The point of order is overruled and the gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered would increase the number of high salaried scientific positions authorized for the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics from the 60 provided by the committee bill to 100.

There has been a great deal of discussion in recent months not only in this body but elsewhere as to the relative state of our aeronautical technology and science and that of our potential enemies.

The National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics is the body on whose shoulders rests the ultimate responsibility of winning this technological race. Unquestionably whether we have better aircraft than our enemies depends upon the skill and ability of this group of scientists. Oftentimes their activities and their work is largely overlooked. The activities of the Defense Department, particularly of the services in test-

ing and demonstrating the end weapons which have been made possible by NACA research, receives a great deal more attention and publicity than the activities of these scientists, who generally work, without any publicity at all, in their laboratories in the less glamorous field of pure aeronautical science. Before they have made the scientific breakthroughs, the scientists in the Defense Department and the engineers in the various aircraft manufacturing companies cannot and do not produce the weapons that for the present and foreseeable future are essential to our survival as a nation.

NACA must lead the way, and if they are not effective and efficient in doing so we will ultimately lose this technological race. Because of the fact that their activities are not so well known, they oftentimes tend to be overlooked. I realize it will be argued that a greater number of these high-salaried scientific positions was not asked for by these agencies. My answer to that is first, that all such requests by directors of such agencies must clear through other agencies of the Government, such as the Bureau of the Budget. Frequently the desires of a particular agency get strained down in being channeled through the various Government channels on their way to Congress.

This is the first time in 7 years that this Congress has seen fit to deal directly with this question of the creation of adequate financial incentives for these highly trained scientific personnel. During that 7 years the workload in all of these defense agencies, particularly the workload of the NACA, has multiplied many times. From all present indications, it will continue to increase in the future. So, while 60 may be adequate for today—and as to that I am not in a position to argue with the committee—I do feel that if 60 is the number we need today, in all probability we will need more in the near future. Undoubtedly we will need more before the Congress gets around to acting on this subject matter again.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the Director of the NACA appeared before our committee and asked for only 60? Now, have any of these gentlemen indicated to you that they wanted more than the committee gave to them? We are simply complying with the request of these gentlemen in that regard.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. None of those people have come to me and indicated any dissatisfaction with the request, but for the reasons I have stated and the slowness of Congress to deal with these situations as they develop, and the fact that these responsible officials have to channel their requests through other agencies, who almost invariably cut down the requests, I do not think that is an adequate answer to the needs, not only the present but the future needs of this agency.

I would like to say that all this measure does is authorize the positions. If the agency does not need the positions at the present time, they will not have to

fill them, but if they do need them in the future, this would permit them to fill the positions without going through the long and sometimes tedious process of trying to gain congressional approval.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CRUMPACKER was granted 1 additional minute.)

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do feel that the need in this particular field of pure scientific research is so great that we should not handicap this agency in any way, or tie strings about them that may block their possible expansion in the future.

After all, if all these posts were filled at the maximum figure permissible, it would cost the Government just an additional \$200,000 a year. As against the billions of dollars we are spending on research it seems to me that this is a very small amount indeed, a very small investment to make in the future security of this country.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

(On request of Mr. HARVEY (and by unanimous consent), Mr. CRUMPACKER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. I was very favorably impressed with the reasoning back of the gentleman's amendment. I would like to ask him, because I know he has given a great deal of study to this problem, whether there will be competent and specially trained people to fill these positions, if authorized? It is one thing to have a position available; it is another to have people with adequate skills and training to fill it.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I may say that they will certainly not be easy to fill. However, if this legislation would induce just a few of the highly skilled personnel who have left these special agencies in recent months to accept higher paying jobs in private industry, to return to the Government service it would have served a very worthwhile purpose. Certainly there is a great shortage of highly skilled scientific personnel. They cannot be just picked up overnight. Certainly over a period of years the personnel would become available; and, as suggested previously, I think this legislation may induce some of those who have left the Government service in recent years to possibly return to it and thus fill the vacancies. It should also induce many now in the Government service to remain and not accept offers from private industry.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the gentleman. Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, our committee in this bill has given the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics the number of scientific and technical jobs they asked for.

I have known Dr. Dryden, who is director of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and Mr. Victory, who

is the executive secretary, for several years. Our committee has wholeheartedly cooperated with these gentlemen insofar as the jurisdiction of our committee is concerned. We gave them first the ten technical and scientific jobs that they asked for the first time. Dr. Dryden and Mr. Victory appeared before our committee in connection with this bill. Here is the printed testimony of these gentlemen before our committee. They asked us to increase the number of these excepted positions from 10 to 60 with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] says he has not been contacted by Dr. Dryden or by Mr. Victory or any other official of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics about this matter. Surely these gentlemen in charge know what they want, and we have given them what they asked for. Certainly they must have a sufficient number of technically skilled and qualified engineers, technicians, and scientists to do this important work.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. There was no contention made before our committee that the Bureau of the Budget had denied the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics a request for additional employees. Will the gentleman agree to that?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Why, certainly.

Mr. GROSS. Has the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee had any word from Dr. Dryden or anyone else from the National Advisory Committee, since our hearings were held, asserting that the 60 extra pay jobs were insufficient?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I have not received any such information. They have been very fair whenever they appeared before our committee and we have never turned down any request from them about legislation. I know they are highly satisfied and well pleased with the action of our committee which gave them the 60 scientific and technical positions they wanted.

Mr. GROSS. If there are supergrade spaces unfilled under the control of the Civil Service, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics could go to the Commission and get additional berths if they could justify the need.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Yes, in these supergrades. They only asked for an increase from 10 to 60 in these scientific positions and we gave them exactly what they wanted. I do not see where the gentleman from Indiana has presented anything to the contrary.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Can the gentleman promise me that the Congress will deal with this subject again in less than 7 years if the need arises?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The gentleman can rest assured that if Dr. Dry-

den and Dr. Victory, officials in charge of the Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, come before our committee with a request, we will give them every cooperation. We have never turned them down. We are not experts in their field and we have to rely upon their judgment. We did so in this case and I appeal to you to vote down the pending amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

(Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to inject myself into this controversy between the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member other than to say that in my opinion, the gentleman from Indiana has a very good point. The reason I take that view is because of an experience I had in 1945.

When the shooting war in Europe ended, a number of members of the Committee on Military Affairs went to France to look into the displaced persons problem and other problems. The gentleman now presiding as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole accompanied us at that time.

One of the things that I remember so very well, and I am sure every Member who was there remembers very well, was Nordhausen, one of the horror camps where the Germans executed thousands of innocent victims that were captured at that time. In going there we had to fly over a very high mountain, and as we looked down to the landscape below we saw that a railroad went into the side of a mountain and came out at the other end of it. Later we found that Hitler had an underground operation for the development and use of V2 bombs. No one knew anything about this until the Americans got into that underground area where the railroad was. He had extrusion presses there where these bombs were developed and built in great numbers. As a matter of fact, they shot many of these bombs from Amsterdam into London where they struck a large church and damaged an extensive area of that city. If Hitler had had one more month, just one month, it was our conviction then that England would have fallen and we would have been left alone to fight that war to its bitter and tragic end.

I mention that experience to demonstrate that the argument presented by the gentleman from Indiana has a great deal of merit. Why not leave the door open slightly so that if the scientists feel that they should have more scientific help they will be able to get it promptly? That experience taught me that sometimes we have to look a little further ahead than we can see at the time we make a particular decision. This may be a little beside the argument here, but I do think the gentleman's contention has great merit. That experience impressed me and it impressed every Member present. Thank God we got there in time and licked the enemy, otherwise Hitler might have taken away our major ally.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize what our chairman, Mr. MURRAY, has said with respect to this proposed amendment. That is, that Dr. Dryden and other officials of this organization appeared before the committee asking for 60 of these new positions, which we gave them. We took care of all of the requests of agencies that appeared before our committee.

Mr. Chairman, the pending amendment ought to be rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, a member of our committee. He is one who has studied this legislation very carefully.

Mr. GROSS. If we adopt this amendment we would be setting a precedent of saying to the various departments and agencies when they ask for an increase in personnel, if they say they want 100, give them 200 in anticipation that they may need 200. That is a very poor way to legislate, and I believe the gentleman from Kansas will agree with me.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I agree with the gentleman. One of our difficulties is to keep these matters from getting out of control. Here is a case where we were extremely careful to see that our defense was not injured in any way, and the witnesses were so convincing with respect to their requests that they were granted in toto; every one of them. Now, when we come to the floor of the House and offer an amendment to almost double it, it is out of order, in my opinion, and ought to be rejected.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Does not the gentleman realize that our defense has been injured in the last months and the last years during which the restriction set up in 1949 was in effect and before the committee and the Congress got around to dealing with it?

Mr. REES of Kansas. With respect to this particular agency, Congress did approve 10 supergrades more at that time than had been granted any other agency.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Back in 1949?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. And a great deal of harm has been done to that agency because of the personnel that was lost to private industry, because they could not pay comparable salaries.

Mr. REES of Kansas. So far as I know, this is the first time a request was made to this committee for the relief that is being granted under this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2, Section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (69 Stat. 179; 5 U. S. C. sec. 1105), is amended—

(1) by striking out in subsection (b) of such section 505 "subsections (c), (d), and (e)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f)" and

(2) by adding at the end of such section 505 the following new subsection:

"(f) The Secretary of Defense is authorized, in accordance with the standards and procedures of this act, to place a total of two hundred and eighty-five positions in the Department of Defense in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grades by subsection (b)."

SEC. 3. (a) The United States Civil Service Commission, the Librarian of Congress, the Comptroller General of the United States, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, and the Secretary of Defense, respectively, with respect to those positions within the purview of subsection (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f), respectively, of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and the appropriate authority, with respect to those positions under jurisdiction of such authority which are allocated to or placed in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (including such positions as allocated or placed on a temporary or present incumbency basis), under any provision of law (including any reorganization plan) other than the above-specified subsections, which is in effect on or after the date of enactment of this subsection, shall submit, so long as such provision of law or reorganization plan remains in effect, to the Congress, not later than February 1 of each year, a report which sets forth--

(1) the total number of such positions allocated to or placed in all of such grades during the immediately preceding calendar year, the total number of such positions allocated to or placed in each of such grades during such immediately preceding calendar year, and the total number of such positions in existence during such immediately preceding calendar year and the grades to or in which such total number of positions in existing are allocated or placed.

(2) the name, rate of compensation, and description of the qualifications of each incumbent of each such position, together with the position title and a statement of the duties and responsibilities performed by each such incumbent.

(3) the position or positions in or outside the Federal Government held by each such incumbent, and his rate or rates of compensation, during the 5-year period immediately preceding the date of appointment of each such incumbent to such position, and

(4) Such other information as the Commission, officer, or other appropriate authority submitting such report may deem appropriate.

Nothing contained in this subsection shall require the resubmission of any information required under paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection which has been reported pursuant to this subsection and which remains unchanged.

(b) In any instance in which the Commission, officer, or other appropriate authority so required to submit such report may consider full public disclosure of any or all of the above-specified items to be detrimental to the national security or the public interest, such Commission, officer, or authority is authorized--

(1) to omit in such annual report those items with respect to which full public disclosure is considered to be detrimental to the national security or the public interest,

(2) to inform the Congress of such omission, and

(3) at the request of any congressional committee to which such report is referred, to present information concerning such items in executive sessions of such committee.

(c) Subsection (b) of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (69 Stat. 179; 5 U. S. C., sec. 1105), is amended by striking out "The United States Civil Service Commission shall report annually to the Congress the total number of positions established under this subsection for grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule and the total number of positions so established for each such grade."

SEC. 4. (a) The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

(1) That part of the paragraph under the heading "Federal Prison System" and under the subheading "Salaries and expenses, bureau of prisons" contained in title II of the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1956 of the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 273; Public Law 133, 84th Congress; 5 U. S. C., sec. 298a), which reads as follows: "Provided further, That the Attorney General hereafter is authorized, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, to place three positions in grade GS-16 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949"; and

(2) Section 631 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 320; Public Law 157, 84th Congress; 5 U. S. C., sec. 171d-2).

(b) Positions in grade 16, 17, or 18, as the case may be, of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, under any provision of law repealed by subsection (a) of this section, shall remain, on and after such effective date, in their respective grades, until other action is taken under the provisions of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 as in effect on and after such effective date.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments, and without objection they will be considered en bloc.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments:

Page 7, line 17, immediately before the period insert "or which may be required by the Congress or a committee thereof."

Page 7, line 24, strike out "consider" and insert in lieu thereof "find."

Page 8, line 2, strike out "or the public interest."

Page 8, line 5, strike out "considered" and insert in lieu thereof "found."

Page 8, lines 6 and 7, strike out "or the public interest."

Page 8, line 10, after "present," insert "all."

Page 8, lines 11 and 12, strike out "in executive sessions of such committee."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, we have read in the newspapers today and yesterday and the day before of a visit made to Egypt by the Soviet foreign minister who recently succeeded Molotov, and we find in the news items the offer of the Soviet Union early this year to help finance a \$1.2 billion project for harnessing the waters of the Nile, the Aswan Dam. We find that apparently conversations are taking place between Premier Nasser of Egypt and the Soviet foreign minister in relation to that matter as well as other assistance

from the Soviet Union. We have read of Soviet offers of the same nature to other countries, and that raises in my mind a question as to what the policy of our country should be. Are we going to rush in, after the Soviets have made some kind of an offer, and make a bigger offer? Or are we going to call the turn somewhere along the line with reference to some of these large commitments?

The attitude and the action of the Soviet Union presents a serious question that our Government and all Americans must consider because, after they have made an offer and we have gone in and made a larger offer, they can then gracefully withdraw and say to the country who is to be the beneficiary, "See? We got America to do it for you." And then they get the benefit of it both ways. And in some cases we do not even receive the minimum feeling of gratitude.

There is a question whether the Soviet Union can go through with its commitments, but in any event, since such offers are made, the evidence seems to be that our country rushes in and raises the ante and offers more. Repeating the result is that the Soviets are thus permitted to back out gracefully but they are enabled to say to the people of, say, Egypt, or other countries, "See? We got you the offer from the United States. It is our action that has gotten you American aid and increased aid. It is we who are your best friends."

Since an offer came from the Soviet Union and the United States then comes in and increases the offer of aid, the whole benefit, it seems to me, redounds to the Soviet Union. No matter how it works out, we lose.

I have been a strong advocate of point 4 assistance. But I do not like this situation where the Soviet Union is moving in and then we come in after them with an offer of more aid, greater assistance, larger loans; then they move out and receive the benefit of the appreciation of the beneficiary, while we get no benefit.

It seems to me that somewhere along the line, particularly in the case of large countries--of course, in the case of a small country, the Soviet could probably go ahead with their commitment--but in the case of a large country, or in the case of a large commitment such as that of the Aswan Dam, our officials should say, "All right, Soviet Union, we have been helping, we have been rendering assistance, we have assisted Egypt in the sum of so many tens of millions of dollars; if you want to come into this field, we are glad to see you do it." Then the issue would be put up to Nasser, because he knows in his own mind that the probabilities are that the Soviets cannot carry out their commitment.

It is getting to be humiliating for us to read of these events. I do not say that the administration does not have it in mind.

My remarks are not to be misconstrued. They are my own personal remarks as an American and in my individual capacity as a Member of the House.

1956

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9637

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am not talking as a Democratic Member, but as an American. I think my few remarks here today pretty much represent the views of the great majority, if not all, of my colleagues, without regard to political affiliation.

It is embarrassing to have the situation in which this great Nation of ours is placed. When we give assistance, at least there ought to be a minimum amount of gratitude for it. We are doing it in our own national interest, but it is also in their national interest.

As I view the situation in Egypt, Mr. Nasser is confronted with a very acute economic question. His playing with the Soviet Union does not deceive me or my colleagues. No matter how strong he might become militarily as a result of Communist aid in that field, his basic problem is an economic one. I think in his own mind he realizes he cannot rely on the Soviet Union, because even if they did give aid they would exact from him attributes of the sovereignty of his own country in addition to other exactions.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What the gentleman is saying is that too many countries are playing both ends against the middle; that is, they are playing the United States off against Russia and Russia off against the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. That in plain language is a fair statement and represents my state of mind.

Mr. GROSS. I would hope, then, with that commendable statement from the gentleman, that when the foreign hand-out authorization bill comes back from the Senate with a greatly increased amount of money, the gentleman will join some of us in sending it to conference with insistence upon the figures in the House bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. My remarks are addressed to those who are administering our foreign aid, asking them to realize that there has to be a reappraisal in the light of the policy of foreign aid and in the light of our rushing in to give greater aid and greater benefits, with the result that the Soviet Union gets the full credit in those countries and all we find is an anti-American atmosphere.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I should like to congratulate the majority leader on what I think is a splendid analysis of the situation. I hope he will not object to my reminding him that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] and I have had resolutions introduced for some time to permit a reappraisal of our foreign-aid program. I mention this merely in the

hope that the gentleman may see fit in his power and kindness to get those resolutions out for consideration.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am aware of those resolutions. If any action is taken toward the establishment of a commission, not to investigate but to survey our foreign commitments and actions in relation to mutual assistance, because I am sure no one would want an investigation, but rather a survey, I favor its being done on the legislative level rather than by a commission in the executive department. That is no reflection on the executive department. However, in a sense, such a commission would be investigating the very branch of Government that brought it into existence.

My voice is raised not as majority leader but as a Member of the House simply to show concern about the unfortunate position of our great country, that does not want one inch of land from another country. We are being placed in this position by the maneuverings of the representatives of the Soviet Union. Then our representatives try to outbid them. The Soviet Union is then permitted to retire gracefully without any commitment and say, "See what we have done for you? We forced the Americans to do it."

To me, that is humiliating and calls for some kind of clear thinking and affirmative action on our part by which we at least call the bluff of the Soviet Union.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11040) to advance the scientific and professional research and development programs of the Departments of Defense, the Interior, and Commerce, to improve the management and administration of certain departmental activities, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 516, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is there a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the Record on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

CREDIT FACILITIES TO FARMERS  
AND AMENDING BANKHEAD-JONES  
FARM TENANT ACT

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11544) to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11544, with Mr. MACHROWICZ in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] will be recognized for 36 minutes, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, the bill the committee brings to you today is an extension of the powers of the Farmers' Home Administration in several different respects. In the first place, I should mention that this extends the period for emergency loans from June 30, 1957, to June 30, 1958, and it increases the authorization for such emergency or disaster loans from \$15 million to \$65 million—an increase of \$50 million for the next 3-year period. It is perfectly true that the new period of extension does not start until 1957, but the present money is used up. The Department has advised us on several occasions that we should proceed expeditiously to provide additional authorization. The other body has made provision in the form of a separate bill. We have included that provision in this general bill.

Along with this extension of time and in the amount of money that we have brought to the House, there are several changes in the scope of the activities. We have for the first time made provision for loans to part-time farmers. It has become more and more apparent every month that a large portion of the farmers of America simply cannot make a living on the farm. More than one-third of all the farmers in America today find that they secure a major portion of their income off the farm. By that I mean a very large share of the people who till the soil in America find it necessary to supplement the income they get from their farm by work performed off the farm. That may mean they are engaged in a business of some kind or it may mean, and oftentimes does mean, that they are employed in industry in

some adjoining community. But, in any event it means that the farms simply are not paying enough to make it possible for farm families to rear their families on the farms. In the past, the Farmers' Home Administration has been restricted in its loans so that it could make no loan to any farmer unless he received the major portion of his income from the farm operation.

That automatically eliminated about one-third of the farmers of America, and generally eliminated those with the smallest income. We have felt that we should not open the door by inviting people who are now employed in industry or in business in town to go into the country and become part-time farmers, and thereby further aggravate the situation. But we found that such a large portion of the people who live on the farm have been depending on a job to pay their living that it makes it impossible under present regulations to finance their operations. The farmer who may have let us say 15 or 20 or 50 acres somewhere out in the country, where he might have made a livelihood in the past, but who now has a position in town is ineligible for a FHA loan at this time, even though he still lives on the same farm. So we say in this bill that if a man during the past 10 years has in any one of those years depended on the operation of his farm for his livelihood, even though today he is making a large share of his living working in town, we will be able to make him an operative loan to carry on his farming operation. We will be able to make him a loan for improving his equipment, his housing, and other activities that are related to his farming activities; but we cannot make him a loan under this bill to carry on a grocery business in town; but we will make him a loan to carry on his farming activities and take as security those farmlands, farm tools, housing, and other facilities that he uses in connection with his farming activities.

We then provide in this bill for a refinancing of existing farmers who are on farms of not more than family size, if the farmers are presently unable to meet the payments and conditions of their outstanding indebtedness and are unable to refinance their debts with commercial banks. But we specifically provide that this can only be done when the creditors of such a farmer are, if necessary, willing to so scale down the total indebtedness that the man, when refinanced, will have security for the loan. In other words, we are saying that we are not going to refinance a man and still leave him owing more than his assets. If we did that sort of thing, all we would be doing would be bailing out the creditors. We would not be helping that man at all. But we are saying to those creditors, if a farmer is in such desperate condition because of a drought, crop failures, or low prices; if he is in such desperate condition that there is no way possible of being able to pay off his creditors, you get together, and if you will let the Farmers Home Administration take over the assets, take the liens, and scale down the debts, then we will let you step out, and we will carry the farmer. We

think that is sound procedure. We think it is absolutely necessary procedure in a great many of the disaster areas.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield, certainly.

Mr. COOLEY. We have heard a lot of talk about the small farmers. I just want to suggest to the gentleman that it might be well for him to emphasize the fact that this agency deals only with small farmers, and that the provisions we are now presenting will be beneficial to the small farmers of America.

Mr. POAGE. Our chairman is exactly correct, as he always is. This agency, the Farmers Home Administration, deals only with what we call small farmers; the small family-size farmer, the farmer who cannot get commercial credit.

I know there are always questions asked about what is a family-sized farm. Let me answer it for you as best I can. A family-sized farm is a farm of whatever size is necessary to most efficiently use the labor and equipment of the family on the farm. That may well be vastly different in different sections of the country, depending on the type of agriculture, and it may be different for different farmers in the same neighborhood.

If the family group is capable of operating a farm of 50 acres with the employment of a minimum of outside labor, 50 acres is a family-sized farm for that family.

But maybe that family is growing tobacco, maybe they cannot efficiently handle more than 5 acres of tobacco or 2 acres without employing a large amount of outside labor. In such case 2 acres would be the family-sized farm for that family.

On the other hand, maybe a family is out in Colorado, where possibly the only way of making a living through farming is the operation of livestock. They may require two sections of land there or even more. Whatever it takes to efficiently use the resources of that family is what we consider a family-size farm.

We attempt in this bill to say that the United States Government is going to assist these families in continuing to stay on the farm. We say that "You have gone through hard times, you are still going through hard times, so it may be necessary to extend the period of your pay-out"; so we provide in this bill that there is an extension of the period.

The present law provides that none of these loans can be extended beyond 7 years, and I feel that that was probably a sound provision. I do not think that it is fair to any farmer or other individual to give him credit over a lifetime without any possibility of ever paying it out. So we provided a limit of 7 years. But in this bill we have said that if the farmer lived in a disaster area which has been certified by the Secretary of Agriculture as a disaster area, and if he has a sound reason for not having met his payments; if, in other words, in the eyes of the Secretary of Agriculture he is a meritorious case and is in a disaster area, the Secretary can extend his loans by the same number of years that he has been in the disaster area. In other words, if

he has had only 1 year of disaster, then he may have an 8-year period; or if he has lived in a disaster area—and I know of some who have lived 5 long years, then he may add 5 to that time and he may have a 12-year payout.

We have also added in this bill to the amount that can be loaned. We have increased from \$7,000 to \$9,000 the maximum amount of original loans for operating purposes, and we have increased from \$10,000 to \$15,000 the indebtedness that the borrowers can owe at any one time.

Remember, the limits in the present law were based on values of about the year 1947. At that time \$7,000 would buy a whole lot more equipment, would support a much larger operation than \$9,000 will today. So we are actually squeezing down rather than extending the size of the operations these people can carry on. But we have said that we are not going to try to hold strictly to the 1947 purchasing power of the dollar.

I believe there is about one more thing in this bill that is deserving of attention. I hope you will understand it. We have provided here for the settlement of certain uncollectible debts. Our record in regard to the collection of these debts has been very excellent, far better than almost anyone would dare predict that it might possibly be. We have charged off less than 1 percent. But of course we have had 5 years of terrible searing drought in large parts of this country. We have had 3 years of terrifically low prices in this country and obviously some people are not able to pay out. Some of these loans were made purely upon the crop, but no crop was grown. Sometimes we took a mortgage on household chattels, the dishes, the wash pot, the cooking stove, and that sort of thing.

The Attorney General came before us and told us that it cost an average of \$150 to collect one of these debts. He will not take them, I am told, unless they amount to \$200. We felt it was ridiculous to spend that amount of money in an effort to collect a lesser amount, so we have authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise and to write off indebtedness of less than \$150 where he certifies there is no possibility of collection and there is a meritorious reason for releasing the debtor. We think that is sound. It is true that the former limit was only \$10, but the Government has been losing money in trying to collect something that we could not collect. Such efforts have accomplished nothing except to cost the taxpayers money. We believe this is the businesslike procedure and is what every big business in the United States does.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that covers the major aspects of this bill. I want to point out that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE] has probably a better knowledge of all of the details of this matter of credit than almost any member of our committee and I know he will cover any details I have omitted.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE].

(Mr. McINTIRE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)